PSG/RSD-003/78 . 30 January 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, Agency's Micrographics

STAT

Consolidation Task Force Study

SUBJECT

DD/S&T Summary Comments on P&PD-ISAS Proposal to Consolidate Agency's Micrographic Activities

1. The DD/S&T is still strongly opposed to the joint P&PD-ISAS proposal to consolidate the Agency's micrographics activities including those micrographics operations located in the DD/S&T offices of NPIC and OD&E. As the DD/S&T representative on this Agency task force team, I have carefully reviewed the P&PD-ISAS staff study; discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the staff study proposals with DD/S&T micrographics manager; and discussed the details of the consolidation plan with P&PD and ISAS personnel. Having taken these actions I am still not convinced that this consolidation proposal will, as assumed by P&PD and ISAS, provide the DD/S&T with the same level of micrographics service and produce a more consistent, higher quality micrographics product. In fact I have concluded from my own review and analysis of the available data that such a consolidation, if implemented, could stiff current and future micrographics applications in the DD/S&T and result in an overall serious decreased level of support to DD/S&T customers.

The P&PD-ISAS consolidation analysis is, in the shared opinions of DD/S&T's micrographics manager, an over-generalized, but admittedly a necessary and in vogue review of the Agency's micrographics personnel, space and equipment savings. This type of an analysis does have an initial appeal to the unsuspecting reader who is easily overwhelmed by raw statistical. data and the manipulative manner in which this data can be used to show. huge significant personnel and dollar savings. If this same logic and staff study approach were used in other Agency support service areas; it could be easily proven on paper by almost anyone that significant people, space and equipment savings could also be realized by centralizing all Agency support services such as: printing and publications support; library activities; map support; computer services; mail and registry distribution support, centralized typing pools, xeroxing services, etc. Unfortunately, this type of raw statistical comparative analysis does not deal with some of the real and significant issues associated with the centralization vs decentralization operational philosophies. that definitely have an impact on an organization's priority production commitments, special customer needs and its people. When these issues

are included into the overall saving formula, the initial reported savings are usually quickly diminished. In fact the DD/S&T analysis shows that when these issues are considered, the P&PD-ISAS cited manpower saving for DD/S&T should be reduced by 50%, the floor space savings by 60%, and the equipment savings by 35%. These reductions along with even more important issues will be addressed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

- 3. In more specific terms there are a number of major concerns that the DD/S&T has with the proposed micrographics consolidation. These concerns are listed below along with associated explanations:
  - a. <u>Inability of P&PD/OL to respond to DD/S&T priority</u> production commitments:

One of DD/S&T's primary concerns with the proposed consolidation is the loss of the Directorate's managerial control over its own ability to respond to established priority production commitments. At present, approximately 5% to 10% of NPIC's and 20% to 25% of ODEE's micrographics tasking requires a less than 24-hour turn around response. In some special cases in OD&E the turn around is a 1/2 to 1 hour response time. Under the proposed centralized plan, many of these priority production requirements could not be met due to the physical problems of getting the material to and back from P&PD in the required customer timeframe. In addition, the DD/S&T is also concerned that the offices of NPIC and OD&E would be relegated to the role of a little fish in a big pond because of the size of their micrographic operations when compared to other Directorates priorities and work volumes, and as consequence would lose the battle in any priority conflict confrontations. The DD/S&T's own experience with other centralized support services has shown that initial turn around service proposals usually look good in theory and on paper but when implemented the services quickly diminish with time. In fact both NPIC and OD&E can site many specific examples of poor turn around from the existing P&PD operations even before centralization. In my discussions with P&PD officials, I saw no evidence that this subject was addressed in any detail in any proposed management centralization implementation plan.

b. <u>Inability of P&PD to effectively respond to DD/S&T special</u> office needs:

The DD/S&T micrographic operations in both NPIC and OD&E are custom tailored to a specific office operational environment and individualized customer needs. For example, the OD&E micrographics operations is built around a contract officer/contractor interactive

environment. In fact, the ODEE micrographics equipment was purchased to interface with similar equipment found at industrial contractor The equipment in this office system is located at several different and strategic component office sites for maximum customer utilization and efficiency. This equipment was also selected so that it could be operated by the office users and responsive to their immediate needs. In this environment the customer or contract monitor, who needs a quick response, can carry their own work to the equipment, complete it according to their own special needs, examine the finished product for suitability and carry the completed work back to their office with a minimum amount of time loss. At NPIC, the micrographics operations are built around a photo interpretation priority exploitation environment designed to support both NPIC and the intelligence community as a service of common concern. In a centralized operation, the DD/S&T would lose these very important individualized production/customer operational capabilities and in so doing, would not be able to as efficiently respond to unique customer requirements and national needs:

c. Loss of essential face-to-face contact between producers and customers:

In both NPIC and OD&E almost all our customers seek help from the in-house micrographics personnel to formulate their special micrographics requests. This personalized liaison effort would be greatly reduced or completely lost in a centralized operational environment. In this environment to whom would the customers go to inquire about how best to submit a given request, seek information on the status or priority of a request, etc.? Without this face to face contact, the Agency's desire to further its micrographic usage and applications would suffer serious set backs. In the NPIC operational environment this liaison contact is particularly important. As a National Intelligence Center, NPIC provides micrographics support to four tenant DOD and GIA organizations located within the Center,

The support given these third party organizations would be seriously hampered in a centralized environment.

d. Additional manpower resources required to handle the increased flow of documents to and from P&PD:

NPIC currently produces approximately 40,000 microimages per month. This equates to approximately 200 to 250 documents per working day. (A document is defined as any unique item with its

STAT

own control number). Each of these documents would have to be logged and wrapped for shipping to P&PD and accurate security control records kept of all transactions. The handling and control of these-documents not to mention the added security risks of document loss - would require one to two additional people in NPIC's registry support services. In addition, extra manpower resources would be needed to both NPIC and OD&E to staff a central point of service for work requests and priority questions coming from NPIC and OD&E micrographics customers. These extra resources would have to be taken from the existing micrographics personnel staffing These requirements would reduce the PGPD-ISAS estimated DD/S&T personnel savings from 6 to 3 people - a 50% reduction in estimated manpower savings. Also NPIC is currently using some of its micrographics personnel to handle non-micrographics-related activities during slow production periods. This work would have to be taken over by other support personnel causing additional manpower resource problems elsewhere.

## e. DD/S&T micrographics floorspace savings:

The DD/S&T savings as cited in the staff paper is in error and should be reduced by about 60%. No savings would be realized in OD&E because their equipment is small and scattered throughout various office locations. Removal of this equipment would only given the immediate office occupants a small expansion capability and as such would not result in a real Agency dollar savings. Also, it would be necessary to retain 30% of the NPIC floor space to house the NPIC Microfilm Master Film thus resulting in only a fraction of the cited dollar savings. In fact, it would probably cost the Agency a considerable amount of money to tear out existing unique micrographics service utilities.

## f. DD/S&T current and future equipment savings outlook:

The DD/S&T's current equipment savings under a centralized operation would be minimal. The OD&E micrographics equipment is non-Agency owned equipment and therefore non-transferable to P&PD. A portion of NPIC's equipment inventory is also owned by DOD tenant components and also could not be transferred to P&PD. In addition, much of NPIC's Agency-owned equipment is duplicated in P&PD and as a result would probably end up as surplus equipment with no real savings to the Agency.

Both NPIC and OD&E recognize that P&PD is the Agency's main micrographics center and neither office is competing with P&PD

or trying to expand their respective operations. Both offices have no intentions of acquiring huge additional micrographics equipment inventories and as such the anticipated future equipment savings in the DD/S&T would also be very small.

g. Loss of organizational efficiency due to disruption of well established production cycles and work flows:

At present NPIC's micrographics operations are an integral part of the production cycles and work flows. To centralize these activities would require both NPIC and OD&E to make service changes to the present production methods in other areas outside the micrographic activities.

## h. Concern for people-related problems:

In the centralization proposal no real concern or management plan was given to the impact of this consolidation on people-related problems. Many of NPIC's micrographics technicians would be either transferred to P&PD or declared surplus with the latter being the more likely. Many of these people are specialists with many years of experience in this field and as such they could not easily be worked into NPIC's existing organizational structure.

## i. Disadvantage of centralization:

In reviewing the various other Directorate responses to the P&PD-ISAS proposal, I was impressed by the comments of on the subject of Disadvantages of Centralization (see paragraphs 21 thru 24). This section very accurately reflects the DD/S&T's views on this subject matter and is in my opinion an extremely vital element in this task force study.

- 4. Listed above are some of the major DD/S&T concerns with the centralization. Many other minor problems such as those listed below add further concerns for this plan.
  - validity of the new proposed consolidated P&PD organizational structure to handling all Agency requirements. (DD/S&T micrographics managers believe that this structure would NOT handle expected requirements.)
    - potential serious security problems caused by a lost or / misdirected classified document.

STAT STAT

- office problems associated with the handling by P&PD of highly sensitive compartmented products.
- time lost in redo and duplicative handling of unsuitable finished products.
- some components reluctant and fear to release office material outside of own immediate office environment.
  - strains on existing overburdened courier services.
- office managers lack of enthusiasm for services because of non-accountability for end results.
- 5. DD/S&T is aware that there are some advantages to centralization, particularly in the areas of micrographics standardization, technical expertise and overall Agency micrographics planning and coordination. DD/S&T recognizes P&PD and ISAS as the Agency's micrographics experts and feels that an alternative to centralization would be increased support from P&PD and ISAS in these areas. Again DD/S&T agrees completely with the alternative position (paragraph #25) as stated by \_\_\_\_\_\_ in his paper. This is a sound alternative and as \_\_\_\_\_\_ says, "it could equal the real cost savings to be gained through consolidation, without the related inconvenience to the customer or the degradation of service and quality".
- 6. The DD/S&T is ready to explore with P&PD and ISAS changes short of consolidation that would result in real savings to the Agency. NPIC in particular stands ready to begin shipping certain portions of its non-priority workload to P&PD if problems in those areas noted above can be worked out to the mutual benefit of all concerned. In this way the DD/S&T can inch toward a phased consolidation plan and savings in those areas that will not seriously effect our production commitments and customer needs.

Chief, Reference Services Division, PSG/NPIC

Distribution:
Orig - Addressee

STAT

STAT

STAT